Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-5 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. Claims 6-21 have been added to more fully claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. New independent Claim 12 recites steps carried out by an application requesting programming of an action, while new claim 18 recites steps carried out by the 'preprogrammed action manager' receiving this request. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Responsive to the objection to the abstract, applicants submit herewith a replacement abstract that is believed to comply with the proper language and format requirements.

Rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by James et al. (US Pat No 6108739)

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-5 are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by James et al.
Amended Claim 1 recites:

> 1. Process for programming actions of resources in a network of domestic devices, including the steps of:
> - sending a request for programming an action by a client application to a manager of preprogrammed actions of a device of the network, the programming request including a set of parameters defining the action and a list of resources involved in accomplishing the action,
> - verification by the actions manager of the availability of the resources involved in accomplishing the action at a time when the action is to be carried out, a corresponding time information being sent in the request,
> - transmission to the client application of a message of acceptance or of refusal of the programming of the action on the part of the preprogrammed actions manager depending on the result of the verification.

Applicants submit that as discussed below James et al. fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1.

James et al. concerns a 'split response bus' computer system having a plurality of interconnected computers. Each computer comprises an internal bus (See Fig. 1, 20a to 20d respectively) to which the CPU and memory is connected. The internal busses are connected to so-called host adapters (18a to 18d respectively), which interface their respective bus with one of two serial busses 22a and 22b. The serial busses are connected through a bridge 24. The role of the host adapters is to adapt the capabilities between the internal busses and the serial busses (see col. 6, lines 65-67). The role of the bridge is to isolate the two serial busses (see col. 7, lines 7-9).

More specifically, James et al. is generally concerned with the processing of split transactions at the level of the host adapters 18a to 18d and at the level of the bridge 24. Each host adapter comprises a message queue 34 and two pairs of request/response subaction queues. The bridge comprises request/response subaction queues.

The Examiner alleges that the 'request subaction' described at col. 6, lines 54-61 and col. 7, lines 24-67 of James et al. anticipates the sending step of claim 1. The cited passages define the notion of a transaction and the content of a request subaction. However, it is to be noted that the request subaction contains a source ID and a destination ID. It is not clear from the Office Action whether these IDs constitute the 'list of resources involved in accomplishing the action' recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner argues that the 'request/resend (sic) protocol, the reject/resend protocol, the busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE' disclosed at col. 8, lines 51 to col. 9, line 34 anticipate the recited verification step. However, applicants note that claim 1 specifies that the request for programming an action includes a list of resources involved in accomplishing that action and that a verification of the availability of these resources at a time indicated in the request is checked. Applicants submit that no description that corresponds to such a limitation is found in James et al.

First, the protocols referred to by the Examiner only concerns the processing of a subaction through adapters and bridges (i.e. a bridge may delay acceptance of new subactions using the busy/retry protocol), because of full queues in these adapters or bridges (see col. 8, lines 51-53 cited by the

Examiner). These protocols have nothing to do with the availability of resources listed in the request sent by the source node for the simple reason that the source node of James et al. has no knowledge of what adapters and bridges are on the way to the destination node – adapters and bridges are transparent for the source node, and therefore, obviously cannot be listed as 'resources' in the request sent by an application, as recited in claim 1.

Second, James et al. does not teach or suggest carrying out verification for availability of a resource at a time when the action is to be carried out, a corresponding time information being sent in the request, since the subaction does not specify such an information (see col. 7, lines 32-67), and since the bridges or adapters do not process such an information. The check of whether a queue is full or not is done when a subaction is received, in a fashion independent of such temporal information contained in the request. See e.g. col. 8 lines 56-57.

Finally, the Examiner argues that the same paragraphs of col. 8 and 9 anticipate the last step of claim 1. However, what is transmitted to the sending node seems to be only an indication of whether a subaction was processed or not by a bridge or an adapter, not a message of acceptance or refusal of the programming of an action depending on the result of a verification of the availability of the resources at a specified time as indicated in the request. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the acceptance or refusal concerns the programming of the action.

In view of the above, applicant submits that James et al. fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, and as such, claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by James et al.

New independent claims 12 and 18 similarly recite the request for programming an action, the verification of the availability of the resources, and the message of acceptance or refusal of the programming of the action, and are believed to be not anticipated by James et al. for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Fabienne Coez et al.

By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 9/15/05

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 on:

9-15-05
Date

Lori Klewin